	Case 3:08-cv-01830-WHA	Document 5	Filed 04/15/2008	Page 1 of 3	
1 2 3 4	REESE RICHMAN LLP Michael R. Reese (Cal. State Bar. 230 Park Avenue, 10 th Floor New York, New York 10169 Telephone: (212) 579-4625 Facsimile: (212) 5673-4272 michael@reeserichman.com	No. 206773)			
5 6 7 8	WHATLEY DRAKE & KALLA Deborah Clark Weintraub 1540 Broadway, 37 th Floor New York, New York 10036 Telephone: (212) 447-7070 Facsimile: (212) 447-7077 dweintraub@wdklaw.com	AS, LLC			
9	Counsel for Plaintiffs				
10	UN	ITED STATES D	ISTRICT COURT		
11	NORT	THERN DISTRIC	T OF CALIFORNIA	A	
12	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION				
13	ARNOLD KREEK, Individually Of All Others Similarly Situated,	And On Behalf	Case No. CV	08-1830 JSW	
1 /1 11					
14	Plai	ntiffs,		ATIVE MOTION TO	
15	VS.	ntiffs,	CONSIDER SHOULD BE	WHETHER CASES CRELATED AND	
15 16	vs. WELLS FARGO & COMPANY, FARGO FUNDS MANAGEMEN	WELLS IT, LLC, Γ, WELLS	CONSIDER	WHETHER CASES CRELATED AND	
15 16 17	vs. WELLS FARGO & COMPANY, FARGO FUNDS MANAGEMEN WELLS FARGO FUNDS TRUS' FARGO DISTRIBUTORS, STEF WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A., Defendants.	WELLS IT, LLC, I, WELLS PHENS, INC.,	CONSIDER SHOULD BE	WHETHER CASES CRELATED AND	
15 16 17 18 19	vs. WELLS FARGO & COMPANY, FARGO FUNDS MANAGEMEN WELLS FARGO FUNDS TRUS' FARGO DISTRIBUTORS, STEF WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A.,	WELLS IT, LLC, Γ, WELLS PHENS, INC.,	CONSIDER SHOULD BE TRANSFERI	WHETHER CASES CRELATED AND	
15 16 17 18 19 20	vs. WELLS FARGO & COMPANY, FARGO FUNDS MANAGEMEN WELLS FARGO FUNDS TRUS' FARGO DISTRIBUTORS, STEF WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A., Defendants. RONALD SIEMERS, Individuall Behalf Of All Others Similarly Si	WELLS IT, LLC, Γ, WELLS PHENS, INC.,	CONSIDER SHOULD BE TRANSFERI	WHETHER CASES C RELATED AND RED	
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	vs. WELLS FARGO & COMPANY, FARGO FUNDS MANAGEMEN WELLS FARGO FUNDS TRUS' FARGO DISTRIBUTORS, STEF WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A., Defendants. RONALD SIEMERS, Individuall Behalf Of All Others Similarly Si	WELLS UT, LLC, IT, WELLS WHENS, INC., Y And On tuated,	CONSIDER SHOULD BE TRANSFERI	WHETHER CASES C RELATED AND RED	
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	vs. WELLS FARGO & COMPANY, FARGO FUNDS MANAGEMEN WELLS FARGO FUNDS TRUST FARGO DISTRIBUTORS, STEFWELLS FARGO BANK, N.A., Defendants. RONALD SIEMERS, Individuall Behalf Of All Others Similarly Si Plai vs. WELLS FARGO & COMPANY,	WELLS IT, LLC, IT, WELLS PHENS, INC., y And On tuated, ntiffs, H.D. VEST	CONSIDER SHOULD BE TRANSFERI	WHETHER CASES C RELATED AND RED	
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	VS. WELLS FARGO & COMPANY, FARGO FUNDS MANAGEMEN WELLS FARGO FUNDS TRUST FARGO DISTRIBUTORS, STEF WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A., Defendants. RONALD SIEMERS, Individuall Behalf Of All Others Similarly Si Plai vs. WELLS FARGO & COMPANY, INVESTMENT SERVICES, LLC FARGO INVESTMENTS, LLC,	WELLS UT, LLC, UT, WELLS UT, LLC, UT, WELLS UT, LLC, UT, WELLS UT,	CONSIDER SHOULD BE TRANSFERI	WHETHER CASES C RELATED AND RED	
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	VS. WELLS FARGO & COMPANY, FARGO FUNDS MANAGEMEN WELLS FARGO FUNDS TRUST FARGO DISTRIBUTORS, STEFWELLS FARGO BANK, N.A., Defendants. RONALD SIEMERS, Individuall Behalf Of All Others Similarly Si Plai vs. WELLS FARGO & COMPANY, INVESTMENT SERVICES, LLC FARGO INVESTMENTS, LLC, FARGO FUNDS MANAGEMEN	WELLS IT, LLC, IT, WELLS IT, WELLS IT, LLC, IT, WELLS IT, WELLS IT, WELLS IT, LLC,	CONSIDER SHOULD BE TRANSFERI	WHETHER CASES C RELATED AND RED	
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	VS. WELLS FARGO & COMPANY, FARGO FUNDS MANAGEMEN WELLS FARGO FUNDS TRUST FARGO DISTRIBUTORS, STEF WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A., Defendants. RONALD SIEMERS, Individuall Behalf Of All Others Similarly Si Plai vs. WELLS FARGO & COMPANY, INVESTMENT SERVICES, LLC FARGO INVESTMENTS, LLC, FARGO FUNDS MANAGEMEN WELLS CAPITAL MANAGEMEN STEPHENS, INC., WELLS FAR	WELLS IT, LLC, IF, WELLS IF, WELLS IF, WELLS IT, LLC, WELLS WELLS IT, LLC, ENT, INC., GO FUNDS	CONSIDER SHOULD BE TRANSFERI	WHETHER CASES C RELATED AND RED	
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	VS. WELLS FARGO & COMPANY, FARGO FUNDS MANAGEMEN WELLS FARGO FUNDS TRUST FARGO DISTRIBUTORS, STEF WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A., Defendants. RONALD SIEMERS, Individuall Behalf Of All Others Similarly Si Plai VS. WELLS FARGO & COMPANY, INVESTMENT SERVICES, LLC FARGO INVESTMENTS, LLC, FARGO FUNDS MANAGEMEN WELLS CAPITAL MANAGEMEN	WELLS IT, LLC, IF, WELLS IF, WELLS IF, WELLS IT, LLC, WELLS WELLS IT, LLC, ENT, INC., GO FUNDS	CONSIDER SHOULD BE TRANSFERI	WHETHER CASES C RELATED AND RED	
15 16 17 18	VS. WELLS FARGO & COMPANY, FARGO FUNDS MANAGEMEN WELLS FARGO FUNDS TRUST FARGO DISTRIBUTORS, STEFWELLS FARGO BANK, N.A., Defendants. RONALD SIEMERS, Individuall Behalf Of All Others Similarly Si Plai vs. WELLS FARGO & COMPANY, INVESTMENT SERVICES, LLC FARGO INVESTMENTS, LLC, FARGO FUNDS MANAGEMEN WELLS CAPITAL MANAGEMEN STEPHENS, INC., WELLS FAR DISTRIBUTOR, LLC, AND WE	WELLS IT, LLC, IF, WELLS IF, WELLS IF, WELLS IT, LLC, WELLS WELLS IT, LLC, ENT, INC., GO FUNDS	CONSIDER SHOULD BE TRANSFERI	WHETHER CASES C RELATED AND RED	

Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 3-12(b), Plaintiffs, by and through their counsel, hereby submit this Administrative Motion requesting consideration of whether the two cases listed below are related and should therefore be assigned to the same judge:

- (1) Kreek v. Wells Fargo & Co., et al., Case no. CV 08-01830 JSW ("Kreek action"); and
- (2) Siemers v. Wells Fargo & Co., et al., Case No. CV 05-04518 WHA ("Siemers action").

The *Siemers* action has been presiding in front of Judge William H. Alsup for approximately two and a half years. Final approval of the settlement and final judgment in the *Siemers* action were entered on February 5, 2008. Plaintiffs in the *Kreek* action filed their complaint in the Northern District of California on April 4, 2008. The actions allege the same facts against several of the same defendants but the *Kreek* action was brought on behalf of purchasers of Wells Fargo mutual funds not included in the class certified in the *Siemers* action. As set forth in greater detail below, the two actions are related within the meaning of Civil Local Rule 3-12 and should be assigned to the same judge.

Local Rule 3-12 provides that an action is related to another when: "(1) [t]he actions concern substantially the same parties, property, transaction or event; and (2) [i]t appears likely that there will be an unduly burdensome duplication of labor and expense or conflicting results if the cases are conducted before different Judges." The *Siemers* and *Kreek* actions satisfy both of these prongs and should therefore be related.

The first prong of 3-12 is satisfied. Both actions are brought on behalf of a class of individuals who purchased Wells Fargo mutual funds and both name several of the same defendants, Wells Fargo and various subsidiaries of Wells Fargo. Both actions allege the same set of core facts: that defendants allegedly engaged in a kickback scheme by creating a revenue-sharing agreement with brokerages and selling agents who sold Wells Fargo mutual funds. The events in question in both the *Siemers* action and the *Kreek* action are virtually identical, the only difference being the specific funds in which the scheme was perpetrated. Moreover, the mutual funds at issue in *Kreek* were initially part of the mutual funds in *Siemers*. Furthermore, the *Kreek* action

2

3

1

5 6

8 9

71

11

10

13

12

14

15 16 DATED: April 14, 2008

17

18

19

20

21

22

2324

25

26

27

28

specifically notes that the case is premised on the facts alleged in the *Siemers* action. Finally, both actions allege violations of the federal securities laws and seek the same relief.

The second prong of 3-12 is also satisfied. Because the actions involve several of the same defendants, the same set of core facts and the same causes of actions and requests for relief, the *Kreek* action will require adjudication of common legal and factual issues that were raised in the *Siemers* action. Furthermore, duplication of labor and expense will result from assigning the *Kreek* action to a judge other than Judge William H. Alsup, who is already familiar with the factual and legal issues in the *Siemers* action. Having the actions conducted before two different judges would also pose the risk of conflicting results.

Plaintiffs have conferred with Defendants, who, while denying the allegations set forth above, do not oppose this motion.

Plaintiffs therefore respectfully request that the actions be deemed "related" to each other and assigned to Judge William H. Alsup pursuant to Local Rule 3-12(f).

REESE RICHMAN LLP				
By: <u>/s/ Michael R. Reese</u>				
Michael R. Reese				
230 Park Avenue, 10 th Floor				

New York, New York 10169 Telephone: (212) 579-4625 Facsimile: (212) 253-4272

- and -

WHATLEY DRAKE & KALLAS, LLC

Deborah Clark Weintraub Elizabeth Rosenberg 1540 Broadway, 37th Floor New York, New York 10036 Telephone: (212) 447-7070 Facsimile: (212) 447-7077

Counsel for Plaintiffs